Performance Management Plans – Questions and Answers
By Jeffrey Swedberg, ANE/SPO/DIS
February 23, 2006

Q. What is the purpose of this document?
A. This informal primer on the Performance Management Plan (PMP) process attempts to answer actual and anticipated questions from USAID operating units. It is a companion piece to an earlier document on data quality assessments. As in that document, much of the information comes from the ADS 203 which serves as the agency's rule book on performance monitoring. There is already a great deal of agency guidance on the subject and links to it are provided. This Q and A format attempts to provide a more reader-friendly primer on relevant USAID rules, coupled with a review of the evaluation and audit record that highlights some of the problems USAID Operating Units should seek to avoid when designing their PMPs.

Q. What is the organizing format?
A. This document is grouped into three categories of questions.
•   ADS/ANE Bureau Guidance – content and format of PMPs.
•   Indicator quality – including do's and don'ts from the evaluation record
•   The role of auditors: what questions they ask and what critiques they make
•   What assistance is available to help Operating Units prepare a PMP

Q. What are the most important points to take away?
 A. The PMP is an auditable requirement for all Operating Units and data from PMP indicators are now being made public as part of the Congressional Budget Justification. Therefore, all Missions must have a PMP. Those that have one already must review and update their PMP yearly. Those that do not have one need to develop one as soon as possible.

PMP indicators should be designed with as much definitional precision as possible to ensure that data can be gathered consistently over time with minimal misunderstandings about what is being measured.

Part I, USAID Guidance on PMPs

Q. What is a PMP?
A. A Performance Management Plan (PMP) is a tool used by an Operating Unit and Strategic Objective (SO) team to help plan and manage the process of assessing and reporting progress towards achieving an SO. It is a critical tool for

planning, managing, and documenting how performance data is collected and used. Among other things, a PMP serves to:

• Define specific performance indicators for each SO and IR, determine baselines, and set targets.

• Plan and manage the Annual Report data collection process to meet quality standards.

• Incorporate relevant data collection requirements into activities and obligation agreements.

• Communicate expectations to partner institutions responsible for producing the outputs intended to cause measurable changes in performance.

Q. What is the deadline for completing a PMP?
A. According to the ADS (203.3.3), "Operating Units must prepare a complete PMP for each SO within one year of approval of the SO." However for the ANE Bureau, PMPs must be completed within six months of approval of a new strategic statement. This six month PMP requirement will be included in each Mission's strategic statement approval memo.

Q. What is the relationship of the results framework to the PMP?
A. The results framework is the planning tool, usually laid out in graphic form, which conveys the development hypothesis implicit in the strategy and the cause-effect linkages between the intermediate results (IR) and the SO. Until recently, results frameworks were required in the country strategic plan. Under the new strategic planning guidance, Results frameworks are not required to be included in strategic statements, but experience has taught the ANE Bureau that having a basic Results Framework as part of strategic statements is recommended as it clearly shows the Mission's development hypothesis. Results Frameworks are required as part of the Annual Report (AR) and should be updated yearly prior to submission of the AR. It is important to note that since the PMP is structured along the causal linkages that make up the results statement, a completed results statement is an effective prerequisite for a PMP.

Q. What components are required in the PMP?
A. The ADS requires the following:

• A calendar of performance management tasks that an Operating Unit will conduct over the life of the Strategic Objective

• The set of performance indicators that the Operating Unit will use to assess progress towards the SO over its life.

• Baseline values and targeted values for each SO and IR level performance indicator included in the PMP.

• The source of the data and the method for data collection.

• Schedule for data collection.

• Description of known data limitations of each performance indicator.

Q. What format is required?
A. According to the ADS, "there is no standard format for PMPs. Operating Units should use a format that best fits their management and communication needs." However, given the required elements listed above, most PMPs do follow a standard template. Templates for a complete PMP that meets ADS specifications are found in worksheets contained in the Performance Management Toolkit. http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/200/200sbn.doc

Q. How does the ADS define "performance indicator?"
A. As defined in ADS 200.6, a performance indicator is a particular characteristic or dimension used to measure intended changes defined by a Results Framework. Performance indicators are used to observe progress and to measure actual results compared to expected results. Performance indicators help answer how or if an Operating Unit or SO Team is progressing towards its objective, rather than why such progress is or is not being made. Performance indicators may measure performance at any level of a Results Framework (Strategic Objective level or Intermediate Results level).

Q. How many performance indicators does the ADS mandate?
A. To be considered complete, a PMP must define at least one performance indicator that will be used to measure progress towards the Strategic Objective, and at least one performance indicator to measure progress towards each Intermediate Result in the Results Framework. Each of those performance indicators must include baseline levels, and targets to be achieved over the life of the SO.

Q. Does the PMP have to include common indicators?
A. Yes. Operating Units are required to report on some Agency-level common indicators based on program components which are used for Agency-level decision making and external reporting. These indicators should also be included in the PMP. ADS guidance on this will be released shortly.

Q. What is the difference between the Program Component Common Indicators and SO Indicators?
A. As part of the Annual Report, Operating Units are required to report on Agency-level Program Component Common Indicators based on a common set of program components, which are used for Agency-level decision making and external reporting. Missions began reporting on these indicators in the 2006 Annual Report. The primary distinction between the two types of indicators is that Program Component Common Indicators are for Agency-level reporting purposes, while the SO Indicators included in the PMP are for program management purposes at the Operating Unit level. PMPs should include both types of indicators. It is recommended that Operating Units use Program Component Common Indicators as Results Indicators if Common Indicators can function in both capacities (see indicator criteria below).

Q. Are there any other mandatory indicators?
A. All HIV/AIDS programs must use common indicators that are provided by the Bureau for Global Health (GH), although Operating Units may add program specific indicators where appropriate.

Q. What happens when a result cannot be measured by quantitative indicators?
A. In general, the ADS discourages the use of purely qualitative indicators, although it recognizes that quantitative indicators are not always sufficient. For instance a result such as "advocacy by civil society organizations improved" could be measured with a purely qualitative approach, such as using a panel of experts to assess performance. In most cases, however, the ADS states that "qualitative results can be effectively measured by methods that quantify progress and mitigate subjectivity." Quantitative indicators help make the link between performance and budget and allow ANE to tell its story in a more compelling way.

Q. What kinds of indicators allow qualitative results to be quantified?
A. The ADS specifically mentions three approaches"
•	Milestone Indicator: A type of indicator that measures progress towards a desired outcome by dividing the progress into a series of defined steps. An example of a milestone indicator could come from a policy reform activity, where the first critical milestone may be passage of a law; a second the establishment of an oversight agency; and a third the equitable implementation of the policy. If a milestone plan will be used, the PMP should provide a clear definition of each step or milestone; criteria for assessing whether the step or the milestone has been achieved; and an expected timeline for when each step will be achieved.
•	Rating Scale: A measurement device that quantifies a range of subjective responses on a single issue or single dimension of an issue. One example of a rating scale is when survey respondents are asked to provide a quantified response (such as 1 to 5) to a survey question. If Operating Units use rating scales, the PMP should provide a clear definition of how the rating scale will be implemented and how respondents should rank their answers.
•	Index: A type of indicator that combines two or more data sources into a single measure. Indices can be useful ways to represent multiple dimensions of progress if they have been carefully developed and tested, but the final index value may be difficult to interpret. Examples of commonly reported indices include Couple Years of Protection (CYP) in population programs, the Corruption Perceptions Index, the Index of Economic Freedom, and the AIDS Program Effort Index (API). However, Operating Units should use existing, well-established indices only.

Q. What does the ADS say about incorporating gender into indicators?
A. Performance management systems and evaluations at the SO and IR levels must include gender-sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data when the

technical analyses supporting the SO, the Intermediate Results, or the activities to be undertaken under the SO demonstrate that
• The activities or their anticipated results involve or affect women and men differently; and
• If so, this difference would be an important factor in managing for sustainable program impact.

In general, if gender disaggregated data are available, the indicator should provide this level of disaggregation. Many of the Program Component Indicators (common indicators) ask for data disaggregated by gender. To the extent possible, Operating Units should disaggregate the data by gender for the Program Component Indicators.

Q. What role should evaluations play in the PMP?
A. The PMP should contain an evaluation plan. An evaluation is a relatively structured analytical effort undertaken selectively to answer specific management questions regarding USAID-funded assistance programs or activities. The PMP should contain a section to identify what evaluation issues can be predicted based on anticipated management need.

Q. What does the ADS say about setting baselines?
A. For each indicator in a PMP, the Operating Unit should include performance baselines and set performance targets that can optimistically but realistically be achieved within the stated timeframe and with the available resources. A performance baseline is the value of a performance indicator before the implementation of USAID-supported activities that contribute to the achievement of the relevant result. In most cases, baseline values should be measured using the same data collection process that will be used to collect actual performance data. Baselines should be reported in the Annual Report.

Q. What if baseline data cannot be collected until later in the life of the SO?
 A. The Operating Unit should document when and how the baseline data will be collected.

Q. What does the ADS say about setting targets?
A performance target is the specific, planned level of result to be achieved within an explicit timeframe. Operating Units should set targets for the end of the SO time period, and may set targets for the interim years in between as required in the Annual Report. Targets should be ambitious, but achievable given USAID inputs. Operating Units should be willing to be held accountable for achieving their targets. On the other hand, targets that are set too low are also not useful for management and reporting purposes.

Q. How often should PMPs be updated?
A. The ADS suggests updating PMPs with new performance information as programs develop and evolve. This is usually part of the Operating Unit's Annual

Portfolio Review process and would include an assessment of all performance indicators (at both SO and IR levels) and cover each data source.

Q. Can performance indicators be changed?
A. According to the ADS, Operating Units may change, add, or drop performance indicators based on a compelling reason. This is not encouraged, however, since changing performance indicators frequently may reduce the comparability of performance data over time and thereby weaken performance management and reporting efforts. Operating Units generally have the authority to approve changes to performance indicators without Bureau or Agency approval, but are responsible for documenting these changes while updating their PMPs. If the PMP is updated, the Operating Unit should describe the reason(s) for the change, along with final values for all old indicators and baseline values for any new indicators.

Q. Can SOs be changed in the process of modifying a PMP?
A. If a change in a performance indicator reflects a "significant" modification to a previously approved SO, the Operating Unit must send a memorandum to the responsible Bureau or use the Annual Report cover memo to request approval to make a significant change to the SO as a result of the new performance indicator. The memorandum should include a brief discussion of the reason(s) for the indicator change, along with final values for all old indicators and baseline values. The Operating Unit should state why it considers this change to be "significant." Subsequently, the responsible Bureau must communicate its approval to the Operating Unit in writing.

Q. What if there is doubt about whether a change is "significant" or not?
A. If an Operating Unit is uncertain as to whether a change in a performance indicator is "significant" or not, it should request guidance from the responsible Bureau. If the change is not "significant," the change should be reported in the Annual Report cover memo as previously approved by the Operating Unit. Operating Units must consult with the Bureau of Global Health before making changes to any HIV/AIDS program performance indicators.

Q. What is the relationship between the PMP and the Annual Report?
A. Operating Units will designate a subset of performance indicators from the PMP as targets for measuring success in the upcoming Annual Report. Annually, for each SO the Operating Unit must designate a few (typically three to five) performance indicators from the PMP that will be used in the Annual Report to report on the performance of the program for that year. This is in addition to the Common Indicators. Operating Units should designate performance indicators from the PMP that will best demonstrate progress towards achieving the SO for the given year. For each of the performance indicators selected for the AR, the Operating Unit must establish performance targets against which the Operating Unit will assess performance of the SO for the given year.

Q. When should the indicators be chosen for the Annual Report?
A. According to the ADS, the Operating Unit must select the performance indicators and the performance targets for the Annual Report at least nine months before the end of the fiscal year (by December 31). The designation must be fully documented in a decision memorandum signed by the director or designee of the Operating Unit. Once an Operating Unit has selected the performance indicators and targets that will be included in the upcoming Annual Report, the selection of the performance indicators or targets must not be changed for that year.

Q. What if the Operating Unit later determines indicators or targets previously selected for that year's Annual Report are not realistic or achievable?
 A. The ADS states that "the Operating Unit must report that the performance targets were not met and must explain why."

Q. Will Annual Report performance scores be made public?
A. Yes. As of 2006, each SO's performance score will be published in the Country Overview portion of the Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ). This performance score is computer generated using the SO Indicator data submitted in the Annual Report Application. OMB and the Congress want to see a link between performance and budget and they want to see how well USAID programs are performing.

Q. How are SO scores determined?
A. An indicator score is calculated by taking the "actual" data the indicator achieved and dividing it by the target the mission had set. For example, a score of 1.0 means the target and actual are the same (or the indicator "met" its target), and a score of 2.0 means the actual was twice the target. PPC considers a score of less than 0.90 to mean that the indicator "failed to meet its target," whereas a score of greater than 1.10 "exceeded its target". Greatly exceeding targets means to PPC that targets were low-balled and thus PPC has capped the possible score an indicator can achieve at 2.0. This also prevents an individual indicator from skewing the overall score of an SO. Each individual score is then multiplied by it's weight, then added to the other weighted SO indicator scores, and this total is then divided by the total weights (i.e. if you have 3 indicators and one is weighted 2 and the other two are weighted 3, then you will divide by 8).

Q. How many indicators should there be per result in the PMP?
A. In most cases, two or three indicators per result (per each Strategic Objective and each Intermediate Result) should be sufficient to assess performance. In rare instances, if a result is narrowly defined, a single indicator may be adequate. Too many indicators may be worse than too few since all performance indicators require resources and effort to collect, analyze, report, and use.

Q. How much money should be spent on performance monitoring?
A. According to the ADS, 3 to 10 percent of total program resources should be allocated for this purpose.

Q. What should the role of implementing partners be in PMPs?
A. Performance indicators often require data collection by the partners and should therefore be designed in close consultation with them. As much as possible, performance data collection should be integrated with the performance management activities of implementing partners and incorporated into their work plans with appropriate funds allocated. Integrating USAID and partner efforts reduces the burden on USAID and, more importantly, ensures that partner activities and USAID Strategic Plans are well aligned.

Q. What if data collection for a particular indicator would be too costly?
A. If anticipated costs appear prohibitive, the Operating Unit should consider
• Modifying the relevant result (Strategic Objective or Intermediate Result level)
• Revising the data collection method of performance indicators, or selecting other performance indicators, in order to select a less expensive data collection method.

Part II, Indicator Quality

Q. What criteria does the ADS give for selecting performance indicators?
A. Operating Units should use the seven criteria below (abbreviated D-O-U-P-A-T-A)
a. Direct. Performance indicators should closely track the results they are intended to measure.
b. Objective. Performance indicators should be unambiguous about what is being measured.
c. Useful for Management. Performance indicators selected for inclusion in the PMP should be useful for the relevant level of decision-making.
d. Practical. Operating Units should select performance indicators for which data can be obtained at reasonable cost and in a timely fashion.
e. Attributable to USAID Efforts. Performance indicators should measure changes that are clearly and reasonably attributable, at least in part, to USAID efforts. If more than one agency or government is involved in achieving a result, Operating Units should describe exactly what role each played in achieving the result.
 f. Timely. Performance indicators should be available when they are needed to make decisions. Experience suggests that the information needed for managing activities should be available on a quarterly basis. Data that are available after a delay of a year or more may be difficult to use.
g. Adequate. Operating Units should have as many indicators in their Performance Management Plan as are necessary and cost effective for management and reporting purposes.

Q. What are some of the "directness" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. The performance indicator should closely track the result it is intended to measure. The "directness" criterion emphasizes the connection between the indicator and the result being measured. For example, a Mission in Africa was attempting to measure the result: "Improved capacity of entrepreneurs." The PMP indicator it chose was: "the number of entrepreneurs receiving training." Evaluators of the Mission's data criticized the indicator in question because it only measured inputs. Training is not a direct measure of capacity and, by itself, does not reflect any changes resulting from the input (i.e. changes in knowledge, skills, or attitudes; or some change in overall entrepreneur performance). (Note: While not an impact indicator, training data is often required to be submitted to Washington as a common indicator and collection of it remains important. In this case, Operating Units would probably want to design indicators to measure both the input and impact).

Q. What are some of the "Objectivity" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Performance indicators should be unambiguous about what is being measured. Lack of "objectivity" was a frequent criticism contained in several evaluations of USAID PMPs.
Indicators should be uni-dimensional, measuring only one phenomenon at a time, and be precisely defined in the PMP. To ensure that indicators (especially qualitative indicators) are comparable over time, Operating Units should clearly define and document the indicators to permit regular, systematic, and relatively objective judgment regarding their change in value or status.

One example of a non-objective indicator was identified by evaluators of data from a Mission in Africa: "Number and value of business transactions completed." The indicator was intended to measure an enterprise and agribusiness growth SO by tracking a full "basket" of transaction types (finance accessed, sales, asset transfers, joint ventures, etc.) In reality, it reflected virtually any form of business arrangement regardless of the strength of a particular transaction's relation to enterprise growth. For example, within the same reporting interval, one partner equated transactions to realized sales; two others to the value of any type of contract (i.e., loan, sales, joint equity, privatization, etc.); and another to the "number and value of acquisitions" representing the exchange of assets from public to private sector. In other words, some forms of business transactions more closely track business growth than others, but all types were given the same weight.

Evaluators of this PMP proposed an alternative indicator: "Value of Sales." Any reported sale must be supported by some form of contract, which provides a documented audit trail for each specific sale, where the sale was facilitated by a partner. The sales contract between seller and buyer can only be counted once.

Sales are a direct indicator of market activity/business growth. Moreover, sales contracts facilitated by partners provide a reliable measure of attribution. The indicator helps describe the dynamics in the market place in that it shows the relationship not only between the number of deals and value of deals, but also of the relationships between new markets and sales trends.

Q. What are some of the "Usefulness for Management" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Performance indicators should be useful for the relevant level of decision-making (at the SO team, Operating Unit, or Agency level).

One of the most frequently sited problems by evaluators of PMPs - broad and weak definitions of indicator terms – can also result in indicators that are not useful for management purposes. For instance, in the case of an SO level indicator from an Africa Mission – "Employment opportunities created" – evaluators found that each of five implementing partners perceived the indicator differently and adopted their own working definition. One partner used actual full-time jobs of the enterprise; another used prospective employment based on sales contracts; and still another used a complex formula based on variables derived from surveys that were not representative.
Evaluators found that these differing definitions of "employment opportunities" made the indicator useless for management. The diversity of definitions employed by partners made it impossible to collect data in a uniform manner for aggregation at the USAID level.

Evaluators recommended that "employment opportunities created" be replaced with "Growth in net employment." This suggested indicator would have a precise definition:
"the difference between baseline numbers of jobs plus/minus number of jobs existent at pre-determined reporting intervals". A job (inclusive of contractors) is defined as a remunerated activity disaggregated by:
• SMMEs (excluding the agricultural sector) and Agribusinesses;
• Full-time (more than 24 hours per week)
• Part-time (24 hours or less per week)
• Permanent (greater than 3 months continuous employment)
• Temporary (3 months or less continuous employment)
Methodology would involve a random sample of partner clients, extrapolated to the full partner client base, and compared to an acceptable and relevant reference population. An alternative approach would be to establish a control group from which comparisons could be made to a random sample of partner clients. This revised indicator would be far more useful to the managers of the SO.

Q. What are some of the "Practicality" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Operating Units should select performance indicators for which data can be obtained at reasonable cost and in a timely fashion. Data that are very costly to procure are of limited use. The cost of collecting data for an indicator should not exceed the management utility of the data.

With the large role that partners often play in gathering data for PMPs, excessive costs and level of effort involved in collecting data can result in an indicator not being practical. Therefore, USAID should ensure that, wherever possible, the data reporting requirements contained in agreements signed with partners are consistent with the nature of the normal operational activity of the partners. This will help ensure that partners have the ability to provide valid and reliable primary data. To maximize practicality, partners should be supplied with a standardized template for the reporting of data to USAID, which clearly delineates any required aggregations or desegregations on the behalf of the partner.

Q. What are some of the "Attribution" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Performance indicators included in the PMP should measure changes that are clearly and reasonably attributable, at least in part, to USAID efforts. Attribution exists when the outputs produced by USAID financed activities have a logical and causal effect on the results being measured by the performance indicator. One way to assess attribution is to ask, "If there had been no USAID activity, would the measured change have been different?" If the answer is "no," then there likely is an attribution issue, and the Operating Unit should look for a more suitable performance indicator.

Attribution was a major criticism of the General Accountability Office (GAO) and the USAID Office of the Inspector General (OIG) during the 1990s. According to a 1997 GAO report, "the extent of USAID's plausible association with the country-level results is not reflected in the missions' documents. In some cases, especially in countries where USAID is the largest donor and projects are showing some results, this association may be very strong, while in other cases, the association may be tenuous, based only on token USAID involvement. The agency has not clearly and consistently differentiated between levels of association with development results in its mission performance reports. USAID management acknowledged that it needs to do a better job of making the plausible associations clear in its strategic documents. Citing broad development indicators can result in misleading reports on USAID's performance. The reports we reviewed showed that when missions reported that specific strategic objective performance targets were met, they rarely mentioned other factors outside of USAID's control that contributed to the results, such as assistance from other donors, actions taken by the host governments independently, or favorable international market developments. Furthermore, the USAID Inspector General recently reported that USAID seemed to be taking

credit in its 1996 Agency Performance Report for some high-level impact merely because it had projects in that program area."

While USAID has been credited with improvements in this area in recent years, a 2003 report by General Accountability Office on USAID's Microenterprise Results Reporting nonetheless found that "the extent of USAID's plausible association with the country-level results is not reflected in the missions' documents. In some cases, especially in countries where USAID is the largest donor and projects are showing some results, this association may be very strong, while in other cases, the association may be tenuous, based only on token USAID involvement. The agency has not clearly and consistently differentiated between levels of association with development results in its mission performance reports. USAID management acknowledged that it needs to do a better job of making the plausible associations clear in its strategic documents."

Q. What are some of the "Timeliness" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Ideally, experience suggests that information for managing activities should be available on a quarterly basis. Even data that are available on an annual basis may not be as useful for addressing routine management issues as data that are available more frequently. For instance, evaluators of a PMP in a Latin American Mission criticized the fact that, for some "indicators, data are being reported annually at best," Data that are collected infrequently (every 2-5 years), or with a substantial lag time (longer than a year), may be useful for tracking long-term trends and confirming the accuracy of lower-level data. Such indicators should be supplemented with other performance indicators which are able to reflect program performance on a more frequent basis.

Q. What are some of the "Adequacy" problems identified with USAID indicators?
A. Operating Units should strike a balance between having too many indicators, which can increase the cost of collecting and analyzing the data, and too few indicators, which could be insufficient to assess progress. The general rule of thumb is two to three indicators per result.

Evaluators of one PMP for a Mission in Latin America found the indicator: "Number of village potable water systems constructed/repaired/expanded", inadequate to measure the Intermediate Result: "Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns." It was suggested that the Mission develop a new indicator to measure performance. Suggested additional indicators to improved adequacy included: "Average number of days per year with no interruption of service" or, "Average percentage of users paying their bills on time."

Part III, Audit Issues

Q. What questions does the Inspector General ask when auditing a PMP?
A. A good example comes from an OIG Audit of USAID Mission in Eastern Europe in 2000. The audit objective was to "determine if USAID monitored performance in accordance with Automated Directives System (ADS) and other relevant guidance as demonstrated by indicators appearing in its Results Review and Resource Request (* the predecessor of the Annual Report) report for FY 2002". OIG tested whether the Mission:
•   established indicator baseline data either in the strategic plan or a subsequent R4 report;
•   prepared a performance monitoring plan that contained a detailed definition of indicators that set forth precisely all technical elements of the indicator statements;
•   prepared a performance monitoring plan that identified all data sources;
•   prepared a performance monitoring plan that described the data collection method in sufficient detail to enable consistent use in subsequent years;
•   prepared a performance monitoring plan that specified frequency and schedule of data collection;
•   prepared a performance monitoring plan that assigned responsibility for collecting data;
•   completed an assessment of data quality for the indicators either at the establishment of the indicator or at an interval no greater than three years;
•   reported data that was adequately supported by source documents;
•   reported baseline data in the R4 that were comparable to the data reported for the indicator in fiscal year 2000; and
•   disclosed known data limitations (if any) in the comments section of the R4 report.

Q. What conclusions did the OIG draw from the audit mentioned above?
A. In its 2000 audit of the USAID PMP mentioned above, the OIG found that 3 out of five indicators examined were not detailed enough to ensure that different people at different times, given the task of collecting data for a given indicator, would collect identical types of data. For instance, the OIG criticized the indicator "Value of loans (micro and small) and equity investment made available for micro and Small and Medium Size Enterprises:. According to the OIG, "the plan should have more precisely defined which loans were to be included in the computation of the indicator to ensure that data are comparable from year to year and the baseline does not change. This lack of detail and supporting documentation, the OIG found, could lead to different methodologies being employed from year-to-year, which could invalidate comparison of annual performance data.

According to the OIG, a better definition for this indicator would be, "…loans disbursed and equity investments made….." This more precise indicator would better protect against the confusion over whether loans approved, but not yet disbursed, should be counted.

Part IV. Assistance in PMP Preparation

Q. Who should do the PMP?
A. The ADS is silent on this point. The PMP Toolkit, which remains USAID's most detailed non-ADS source on the subject, asserts that "in most cases, [the necessary PMP] skills will be available within the SO team." Time constraints generally pose a bigger problem for Operating Units than a lack of qualified personnel within the SO team. External assistance in the preparation of PMPs is available through the "Integrated Managing for Results" IQC, awarded to MSI and managed through PPC. Alternatively, the ANE Bureau will organize a team of agency sector and PMP specialists, paying for a portion of the effort with Bureau funds. These Bureau organized teams generally produce a PMP within 3 weeks with a 3-4 person team.

Q. What resources are available to assist with PMP development?
USAID PMP Toolkit
http://www.synergyaids.com/apdime/mod_3_design/ext_doc/USAID%20Perform ance%20Management%20Toolkit.pdf

ADS 200 www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200/200.pdf
ADS 201 www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200/201.pdf
ADS 202 www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200/202.pdf
ADS 203 www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200/203.pdf
TIPS No. 1: Conducting a Participatory Evaluation (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABS539.pdf
TIPS No. 2: Conducting Key Informant Interviews
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABS541.pdf
TIPS No. 3: Preparing an Evaluation Scope of Work (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY207.pdf
TIPS No. 4: Using Direct Observation Techniques
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY208.pdf
TIPS No. 5: Using Rapid Appraisal Methods (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY209.pdf
TIPS No. 6: Selecting Performance Indicators (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY214.pdf
TIPS No. 7: Preparing a Performance
Monitoring Plan (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY215.pdf
TIPS No. 8: Establishing Performance Targets (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY226.pdf
TIPS No. 9: Conducting Customer Service Assessments (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY227.pdf
TIPS No. 10: Conducting Focus Group Interviews (1996)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY233.pdf

TIPS No. 11: Role of Evaluation in USAID (1997)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNABY239.pdf
TIPS No. 12: Guidelines for Indicator and Data Quality (1998)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACA927.pdf
TIPS No. 13: Building a Results Framework (2000)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACA947.pdf
TIPS No. 14: Monitoring the Policy Reform Process (2000)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACA949.pdf
TIPS No. 15: Measuring Institutional Capacity (2000)
www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACG612.pdf;